

DMSWG March 3, 2008 Telephone Conference Summary (1:00-2:30 PM Eastern)

Members in attendance: Bruce Joule, Chad Hanson, Dennis O'Hern, Geoff White, Gregg Bray, Gretchen Jennings, Kathy Knowlton, Lauren Dolinger Few, Patty Zielinski, Risa Oram, Scott Sauri, Tina Chang, Vivian Matter, Wade Van Buskirk

Members not in attendance: Albert Jones, Carlos Rivero, Fred Golofaro, Mike Quach, Ricky Gease

This conference call was paired with a WebEx session.

- Chair opened introduction of two new people. Wade Van Buskirk was added to the Work Group to represent the Pacific States. He currently works for the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission as a RecFIN programmer and analyst, and also is a member of the MRIP Data and Analysis WG. Risa Oram joined us as the new contractor hired to complete information compilation and data entry for the Pacific Islands for Project #1. **Action Item: Chair will update WG contact list and upload to collaboration tool. DONE. Action Item: S. Sauri will contact both to provide summary and login info for collaboration tool and MDMS. DONE.**
- **Action Item: G. White and V. Matter will complete milestone updates for their projects for Chair to provide to R. Andrews. DONE by V. Matter 3/11/08 and added to collaboration tool.** Since Project #2 not really start yet, no appreciable milestone updates.
- V. Matter supplied general update on Project #1. The MRIP Data Management Standard (MDMS) webtool has been successfully implemented and regional coordinators have begun entering program information. P. Zielinski and L. Few conducted beta-testing inputting MRFSS Intercept Program information. Each coordinator was asked to provide a brief update on their data entry to date:
 - P. Zielinski – coordinating with W. Van Buskirk for Pacific States now that he joined WG. Overall it took far longer than she expected and greatly depends on amount of detail for each program.
 - L. Few – For large programs, contact her since she can write script to automatically upload information on data elements, e.g. the Intercept Program had over 300 data elements.
 - G. Jennings – Make sure to have as much information collected at beginning of the process. Overall, going well for Alaska.
 - B. Joule – Has collected the info for North-Mid Atlantic states (all states have contacted him), but not tried entering any yet. He has not contacted Caribbean yet.
 - D. O'Hern – Has entered info on one program and agreed that a lot of information is needed at the beginning.
 - S. Sauri – Has collected most information on HI data to enter. Call him with questions/problems with the MDMS application.

- V. Matter conducted demonstration of MDMS application via WebEx. WG could easily see level of detail required, especially for data elements section, by viewing what already entered for MRFSS Intercept Program.
- G. Jennings – is an acronyms list available, or can we start creating one? For programs with which she is unfamiliar, there are so many acronyms and it would be easier to have a central location for definitions. S. Sauri mentioned one could be added to the help desk of the MDMS. P. Zielinski mentioned that her standard thus far when entering into MDMS was to spell out the full name at least once. Overall, it is an issue beyond the MDMS and may be something useful for collaboration tool for entry by all WG's. **Action Item: S. Sauri will look into adding an acronym definitions file to the MDMS as an initial effort. DONE added to "To Do" list.** Should we investigate using NOAA Fisheries Glossary (date June 2006) as starting point and from that?
- Chair asked V. Matter what she envisioned for the final product in addition to the actual MDMS application. The Project #1 Plan references a final report for submission to the OT. She agrees there should still be a final report, need something that says what was done, why, what information was collected, and a list of the programs.
- Overall goal for completion of data entry into MDMS still end of March, about 4 weeks.
- Chair provided background on overlap and misunderstanding between For-Hire WG and DMSWG, and inclusion now of HMSWG. On paper the initial projects of the FHWG and DMSWG to collect program information looked very similar. However, the MDMS application requires far greater detail than the FHWG needs. Also, the HMS programs need to be covered. There is general agreement with the FHWG as well as P. Pate (he concurred via email forwarded to WG) that any work dealing with standards, program descriptions, metadata development, etc. needs to occur within the DMSWG. The FHWG and HMSWG need to be viewed as dealing with Data and Analysis issues for those specific groups (sort of as specialty versions of the overall Data and Analysis WG), not as responsible for covering *all things* related to them (such as data management, standards, etc). Accomplishing data entry on for-hire and HMS programs ideally needs to be part of the DMSWG Project #1 final completion date (end April at latest, though end March preferred for review by V. Matter and inclusion in final report to OT).
- **Action Item: Chair will email B. Sauls, Chair of For-Hire WG, and determine their timeline for summary data entry on for-hire programs such that our WG can proceed with entering remaining details. DONE. From 3/10/08 email - B. Sauls responded that she would coordinate with S. Sauri to get her WG members on the MDMS, they will enter initial information on for-hire programs only (not programs covering for-hire plus additional fishing modes such as the intercept survey), and they plan a conf call for late March after which she will provide our WG with a progress update. To assist with info transfer, both WG's will allow the other WG to view their folders on the collaboration tool. Action Item: convey FHWG end March progress update to DMSWG. DONE via update to Project Team in 4/10/08 conference call.**

- Chair questioned WG on their ideas for completing such data entry from for-hire and HMS. Can we use some funds initially dedicated to D. O'Hern for Project #1? He replied that though he may need some of the funds, he would not expect to need more than ~\$1K, leaving ~\$14K potentially for contract help. L. Few indicated that one or more persons from a current NOAA contractor might be available. **Action Item: L. Few will coordinate with T. Chang and D. Van Voorhees for information on immediate contractor availability to input for-hire program data, assess possible options and report back to WG. DONE.** S&T has a contract person currently in place (Anjel Lewis) that participated in this WG conf call, but her primary work responsibilities have already been assigned to the Intercept and LPS Programs. However, D. Van Voorhees agreed that our WG could utilize her when she is not busy. L. Few's advice was to use her first to assist her and P. Zielinski with their MDMS responsibilities, thereby freeing them for other WG issues that are increasing quickly. She may have some significant time in March and April since there is not as much demand for her time from LPS then. S. Sauri is already planning to train her in next few days on MDMS. At this point S&T has no other current contract people that we can quickly utilize.
- Action Item: Chair will contact HMSWG Chair, Ron Salz, and determine if he has WG members available to enter their program information. DONE – from 3/13/08 WG Chairs conference call –** R. Salz stated that between him, John Foster and their contractor (Anjel Lewis), he thinks they will be able to cover uploading all HMS program information into the MDMS that conducted by S&T (LPIS, LPTS, catch cards). However, there are other HMS programs that we will need input from other offices that have the lead (e.g. ALRS- SF1, RBS- SEFSC, MA tournament sampling- MA DMR, etc.). **Action Item: Chair asked R. Salz to construct list of all data collection programs related specifically to HMS, and indicate which agency is responsible. DONE** R. Salz & J. Foster completely entered program information for which they covered, and entered at minimum contact info for programs they knew existed, but did not have details. Will have to make further contact and plans for those additional programs.
- Project #2 – main issues are planning and budget. Since initially writing the Project Plan there has not only been significant change due to the MDMS from Project #1, but also the addition of S. Sauri to the WG. If the WG members are in agreement, S. Sauri has offered to take increased responsibility (in conjunction with the Team Leader G. White) with respect to supervising/writing the preliminary requirements document. He has the knowledge, flexibility and time, both from the perspective of our WG needs and position in NOAA. That would significantly decrease the amount of contract help specifically needed for that task. G. White asked if any WG members were concerned with who performed the work relative to who their employer was (i.e., potential conflict of interest?) or just that we need the work done and on schedule. No WG member conveyed concern, and several expressed support for that very reason.
- In the meantime, it has become evident that IT support would be beneficial for collaboration tool maintenance, potential more complex queries/reports from the MDMS (require SQL programming experience), and assistance with the requirements document should S. Sauri take a leadership role in its development. To date, in terms

of the MDMS development, our WG was just lucky that IT programmers were available and directed to assist us (thank you T. Chang). There have been requests for increased function from the MDMS (e.g., reports, custom queries) that would require increased technical resources, i.e., contract support, for which he could also assist with interviews and hiring.

- G. White asked if increased MDMS application made it similar/overlap with InPort? S. Sauri indicated it was only a midlevel application not intended to be in conjunction/instead of InPort. T. Chang concurred that they had been designed to work in tandem, but that InPort was the metadata standard. S. Sauri stated the product from MDMS could be InPorted into InPort. T. Chang indicated it would be best to develop that bridge between the applications soon. **Action Item: S. Sauri will investigate options for integrating MDMS with InPort. DONE added to “To Do” list.**
- S. Sauri also informed the WG that Gordon Colvin, Chair of the Angler Registry Team, agreed they could supply part of the funds necessary for a shared contract position in combination with potential DMSWG funds. That position may cost \$150K or more. **Action Item: By March 17th (two weeks) S. Sauri and G. White will discuss modifications and details of the work planned for the preliminary requirements document. Subsequently, they will draft a summary of resulting IT needs and Task List for review by the WG members (probably via conference call) and eventually R. Andrews. DONE End March S. Sauri submitted Task List which forwarded to WG via 4/11/08 email with requests for suggested funding level for IT contract support.** Only at that point can we make a reasonable assessment of the portion of time (and funds) our WG will require of a shared contract person.
- Chair introduced issue of whether an in-person meeting for the entire WG, not just the two project teams, was necessary for initiation of Project #2 in May. The goal date listed in the Project #2 Plan for completion of both a minimum data elements list and data coding standards is 6/15/08 (with planned start of 4/15/08 dependent on Project #1 completion).
- Tasks would include (at minimum)
 - Update WG on progress to date, outline goals for next 6 months, update WG on MRIP/other WG’s progress, re-involve those WG members not part of Project #1 (whose members have been most active to date)
 - Reassess our project spreadsheet such that it evolves from the more philosophical groupings (e.g., make data more timely) to an ordered list relative to actual application development
 - Begin process of sorting through programs and identifying common data elements
- L. Few and G. Bray expressed opinion as to whether in-person meeting was necessary. To date we have functioned very well via emails, conf call and WebEx sessions. Is there anything that cannot be accomplished within those options that justifies the time, travel and expense of an in-person meeting?
- G. White expressed opinion there was sufficient new work that was detailed development in nature and would dictate near-future direction that would work better in-person.

- S. Sauri proposed collecting information in advance and then assessing whether meeting was necessary. He and G. White will know much more after their review of Project #2 within next two weeks (see Action Item above).
- G. Jennings proposed we block a week in May just in case the meeting is needed.
Action Item: Chair will email WG for early to mid-May availability for a potential two-day meeting. DONE. See below for email summary from S. Sauri on decision to delay in-person meeting.
- Meeting locations were not specifically discussed, though that would affect the amount of travel time.
- Finally, the Chair invited W. Van Buskirk and R. Oram to remain on call to answer any questions, etc.

Email from S. Sauri 3/6/08

Hi Kathy,

Sorry I didn't get this to you sooner (i.e. before you sent the email asking for availability), but Geoff and I had a great conversation on Tuesday and one of the conclusions we came to was that it may be better to push back the 2 day in-person meeting until we are well into project 2. Our reasoning for this is that we already have a project team (Geoff, Patty, Chad, Lauren, Gregg, Carlos, Tina, Scott) identified for project 2 and we feel like we have a pretty good understanding of what we need to do. So unless DMSWG members outside of that group really want to participate in the analysis of the project 1 metadata, I don't think it is necessary for everyone to get together at this point.

Once we have made progress on project 2 and have identified the holes/gaps that will need to be addressed by future projects, we can then get everyone together to a.) review the initial project 2 requirements document (based on the project 1 metadata) and b.) discuss in detail what needs to be done in projects 3 through 8 (and who should do it).

In the meantime, we have come up with a tentative plan for kicking off project 2.

1. Scott (with input from Geoff and the rest of the project 2 team) will put together a new document to supplement the project 2 plan. This document will include more detailed plans on how to tackle the analysis of the project 1 metadata as well as a revised milestones timeline.
2. The project 2 team will divide into 2 sub-teams
 - a. Data Elements - The first team will be responsible for performing an analysis of the Data Elements metadata from project 1 (e.g. compiling and organizing a comprehensive list of data elements, categorizing data elements, recommending standard data types and identifying each element as required or optional (possibly omitted?)).
 - b. Coding Standards - The second team will be responsible for performing an analysis of existing regional and national codes (e.g. identifying issues with redundancy and overlap, recommending codes to be used in MRIP, building code translation maps, identifying related issues).

Geoff and I are recommending the following teams, but are open to moving people around if necessary.

- a. Data Elements - Scott, Lauren, Gregg, Carlos
- b. Coding Standards - Geoff, Patty, Chad, Tina

3. At some point these two teams will need to rejoin and begin working on requirements for a database to house the recommended data elements

4. The project 2 team will consult the DAWG to ensure the recommended data elements and coding standards are in line with any design changes (Note: not sure exactly at what point this will happen - might happen at several points, also likely to consult other WGs)

5. Scott (with input from the project 2 team) will put together the bones of a full requirements document, which will detail known questions/issues/gaps and contain placeholders for requirements to be addressed by future projects.

6. The project 2 team will then submit this requirements document for review by the larger DMSWG, at which point it may be advisable to have the 2 day in-person meeting/workshop.

Again, this all a tentative plan and needs to be run by the project 2 team, if not the whole DMSWG. However, I wanted to give you a heads up on what we're thinking.